

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the clarity and conciseness of the Office Action and for the citation of the references which have been studied with interest and care.

Specification

The disclosure was objected to because of the following informalities: The serial number and date areas of the related applications section must be completed.

In view of the amendments to the specification providing the serial number and date, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Figure 1 does not include 33.

FIG. 1 has been amended to show the view select switch 33; no new matter has been added. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al. (US 5,610,654) in view of Safai et al. (US 6,167,469).

Parulski et al. discloses an automatic exposure control system for an electronic still camera which optimizes the tradeoff between image blur and noise by adjusting the gain of a programmable amplifier and the lens aperture in accordance with lens focal length setting. Referring to FIG. 1 of Parulski et al., "[t]he microprocessor 28 sets the gain of the programmable amplifier 16, lens f-number, and shutter time, based on the light meter reading [from the photodiode 24] and the lens focal length setting [from zoom in and zoom out switches provided in the user controls 30] using a look-up table stored in the internal memory of the microprocessor 28 (alternatively the microprocessor can calculate the correct settings based on stored algorithms)." [Parulski et al., column 2, lines 40-46.]

Applicant's electronic device for displaying a buffered image provides a user with the ability to correct for image degradation in a live view mode of operation resulting from variable low lighting conditions. The claim interpretation recited at page 3 of the Office Action is incorrect; Applicant's invention does not involve automatically adjusting the gain of an amplifier in response to zoom in and zoom out user inputs. Rather, Applicant's method

and electronic device for displaying a buffered image allow a user to adjust the viewability of the captured image by causing the strength of an analog or digital signal indicative of the displayed image to be increased or decreased depending upon ambient lighting conditions and user input. Independent claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended to provide clarification in this regard.

Safai et al. discloses that "[a] display integral to the camera, such as a liquid-crystal display (LCD), provides a viewfinder function by showing image formed by the lens and CCD prior to storage." [Safai et al., column 1, lines 31-33.] Referring to FIG. 2, Safai et al. also discloses a photo processor 208 that receives and processes signals from an analog-to-digital converter (ADC) 206. Regardless, Safai et al. principally involves a method of transporting an image formed by a digital camera, and displaying, in a display device of a digital camera, a graphical representation of a user input device. Even if the cited references are ultimately determined to have been properly combined, for the reasons discussed above it is respectfully submitted that their collective teachings fail to disclose or suggest Applicant's claims.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al. in view of Safai et al. and further in view of Fellegara et al. (US 2001/0015760).

Fellegara et al. discloses an electronic camera embodiment with a quick review mode for displaying a working image on a display screen in response to a quick review signal entered by the camera operator. In an embodiment, the control processing means selectively generates a quick review from the working image stored in the working memory and supplies the quick review image to the display screen without requiring availability of the non-volatile memory. In another embodiment, the camera operator interface may include a quick review switch so that the control processing means activates the display screen to display the quick review image as long as the quick review switch is activated.

It is an object of Fellegara et al. to allow the camera operator to review a last captured image without causing a large energy drain. It is a further object of Fellegara et al. to provide a camera in which the last captured image can be reviewed regardless of whether a removable memory medium is attached to the camera. Fellegara et al., however, does not appear to disclose or suggest responding to a manual indication from a user that the image is sufficiently obfuscated due to lighting conditions to lack discernible features. For the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the collective teachings of the cited references fail to disclose or suggest Applicant's claim.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al. in view of Safai et al. and further in view of Nakai et al. (US 5,311,245).

Nakai et al. discloses a camera system operable by carrying data from a camera accessory to a camera body. While Nakai et al. does indeed disclose that "it is desirable to carry out a warning informing the photographer of an over-exposure condition" [column 20, lines 42-44], this reference provides no disclosure or suggestion of automatically displaying a set of control icons... to help facilitate user adjustments to improve image quality. Moreover, Nakai et al. does not disclose or suggest a programmable amplifier responsive to a manual indication from a user that the image is sufficiently obfuscated due to lighting conditions to lack discernible features. Even if the cited references are ultimately determined to have been properly combined, for the reasons discussed above it is respectfully submitted that their collective teachings fail to disclose or suggest Applicant's claim.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

For the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that none of Applicant's claims would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art over the collective teachings of the cited references. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Concurrence by the Examiner and early passage of the application to issue are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter L. Holmes
Reg. No. 37,353
Attorney for Applicant

May 17, 2004

HENRICKS, SLAVIN & HOLMES LLP
840 Apollo Street, Suite 200
El Segundo, California 90245-4737
Telephone: (310) 563-1454
Facsimile: (310) 563-1460